

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 10th April, 1972

No. 3902-4Lab-72/13431.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Adheso Rubber Works, Gurgaon.

BEFORE SHRI P.N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 197 of 1971

Between

THE WORKMAN SHRI KARTAR SINGH, C/o GENERAL SECRETARY, GURGAON FACTORY WORKERS UNION, GURGAON AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. ADHESO RUBBER WORKS, GURGAON

Present :

Shri Shardha Nand, for the workman.
Shri Tirlok Nath, for the management.

AWARD

The following industrial dispute between the parties was referred to this Court of adjudication,—*vide* Gazette Notification No. ID/GG/20A-71, dated 4th June, 1971 :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Kartar Singh was justified and in order ? If not ; to what relief is he entitled ?

It is not necessary to decide the case on merits because the representative of the management has made a statement that the workman has been taken back into service and now there is no dispute between the workman and the management. The representative of the workman admits the correctness of the statement made on behalf of the management.

In view of the above statement, I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

The 3rd April, 1972.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 511, dated Rohtak, the 4th April, 1972

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 3896-4Lab-72/13434.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Adrash Woollen Industries, Panipat.

BEFORE SHRI P.N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 147 of 1971

Between

THE WORKMAN SHRI LACHMAN DASS, C/o GENERAL SECRETARY, ENGINEERING AND TEXTILE WORKERS UNION, G.T. ROAD, PANIPAT AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. ADRASH WOOLLEN INDUSTRIES, PANIPAT

Present :

Shri Lachman Dass, workman.
Shri Subash Chander Gupta, for the management.

AWARD

The following industrial dispute was referred to this Court for adjudication,—*vide* Gazette Notification No. ID/KNL/5B-71/ dated 4th August, 1971 :—

“Whether Shri Lachman Dass should have been re-employed on the re-start of the Ring Frame (Spinning) Department with effect from 1st July, 1970 ? If so ; with what details and from which date ?

It is not necessary to decide the case on merits because the concerned workman Shri Lachman Dass has made a statement that he has received Rs 1,000 in full and final settlement of his claim. The representative of the management admits the correctness of the statement made by the workman.

In view of the statements, I give my award that the workman is not entitled to any further relief.

No order as to costs.

The 3rd April, 1972.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak

No. 512, dated Rohtak, the 4th April, 1972

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary of the Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 3817-ASO-Lab-72/13478.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 85 of the Factories Act, 1948 (Act 63 of 1948) and all other powers enabling him in this behalf the Governor of Haryana hereby declares that all the provisions of this Act shall apply to all places in the State of Haryana wherein solicate manufacturing process is carried on with or without the aid of power or is so ordinarily carried or not with standing that :

(1) the number of persons employed therein is less than ten if working with the aid of power

and less than twenty if working without the aid of power, or

(ii) the persons working therein are not employed by the owner thereof but are working with the permission of or under agreement with such owner ;

Provided that the manufacturing process is not being carried on by the owner only with the aid of his family.

The 12th April, 1972

No. 4005-4Lab-72/13884.—In pursuance of the provisions of section, 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Auto Branch Corporation, G.T. Road, Rai.

BEFORE SHRI P.N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 244 of 1971

Between

The workman Shri Dalip Singh, C/o General Workers Union, Sonepat and the management of M/s Auto Brush Corporation, 20/7, G.T. Road, Rai.

Present:

Nemo; for the workman.
Nemo; for the management.

AWARD

The following industrial dispute between the workman Shri Dalip Singh and the management of M/s Auto Brush Corporation, 20/7, G.T. Road, Rai, was referred to this Court for adjudication,—*vide* Government Gazette Notification No. ID/RK/71, dated 29th November, 1971:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Dalip Singh was justified and in order ? If not; to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties for 14th January, 1972. This date was changed to 1st March, 1972 but no body appeared on the date fixed although the parties were duly informed of this date. The management have sent a written reply by post in which they have stated that the dispute between the parties has been amicably settled. The workman has also sent a letter under registered cover in which he has stated that the dispute between the parties is compromised and he does not press his claim for re-instatement. Since the workman has not led any evidence to prove that the termination of the services was not justified, I hold that he is not entitled to any relief. I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

The 6th April, 1972.

P.N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 537, dated 6th April, 1972

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P.N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana Rohtak.

No. 4014-4 Lab-72/13886A.—In pursuance of the provisions of section, 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Bareja Engineering Industries, Private Ltd., Gurgaon.

BEFORE SHRI P.N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 42 of 1971.

Between

The workman Shri C.I. Paul, C/o General Secretary, Engineering Mazdoor Union (I.N.T.U.C.), Gurgaon and the management of M/s Bareja Engineering Industries (P) Ltd; 1/1, Manesar Road, Gurgaon.

Present:

Shri C.B. Kaushik, for the workman.
Shri Krishan Lal, for the management.

AWARD

The following industrial dispute between the workman Shri C.I. Paul and the management of M/s Bareja Engineering Industries (P) Ltd., Gurgaon, was referred to this Court for adjudication,—*vide* Government Gazette Notification No. ID/GG/71-C-71 dated 13th April, 1972:—

“Whether the termination of Shri C.I. Paul was justified and in order ? If not; to what relief is he entitled ?

It is not necessary to decide the case on merits because the workman Shri C.I. Paul made a statement that he has received Rs 750 in full and final settlement of all his claims and he has given up the claim for his re-instatement. Shri M.L. Sehgal, Manager of the respondent concern admits the correctness of the statement made by the workman.

In view of the above statements, I hold that the workman is not entitled to any further relief. I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs.

The 7th April, 1972.

P.N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 544, dated Rohtak, the 7th April, 1972

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.